DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 356 UD 021 312

AUTHOR	Morishima, James K.; Mizokawa, Donald T.
TITLE	Education for, by, and of Asian/Pacific Americans, II.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 80
CONTRACT	NIE-G-76-0069
NOTE	41p.; For related documents see UD 021 311 and UD 021 313.
AVAILABLE FROM	Horace Mann Bond Center for Equal Education, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Room 2220, University Library, Amherst, MA 01003 ($4.00 plus postage).
JOURNAL CIT	Research Review of Equal Education; v3 n4 Fall 1979
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; *Asian Americans; *Bilingual Education; Communicative Competence (Languages); Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Ethnic Stereotypes; Ethnic Studies; Postsecondary Education; *Psychological Characteristics; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Pacific Americans

ABSTRACT

This report examines the community and psychosocial concerns of Asian/Pacific American parents, teachers, and students in public and postsecondary education. Limited access to education is attributed to (1) the lack of academic models; and (2) language differences and communications barriers that result in educational discrimination. Bilingual education and English as a Second Language programs for Asian/Pacific Americans are analyzed, and the Asian American community's perceptions of these programs are considered. A psychosocial profile of Asian/Pacific Americans is developed which explores assertiveness, speech anxiety, and frustration aggression in Asian American behavior. Cultural values held by Asian Americans are considered in relation to their educational and occupational goals. Postsecondary Asian/Pacific studies programs are also discussed. The authors conclude that underlying the issue of equal education for Asian and Pacific Americans is the more general issue of human rights. (APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199356

4

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

2

Volume 3, No. 4/Fall 1979

Meyer Weinberg, Editor
Kevin F. Grennan, Editorial Associate
Sarge Ruck, Development Director

Published quarterly by the
Horace Mann Bond Center for Equal Education
School of Education, University of Massachusetts
Room 2220, University Library
Amherst, MA 01003
Phone: 413/545-0327

US ISSN 912008-14-8

Subscription rates:

1 year $15.00
2 years $28.00
3 years $38.00
(Add $1.50 per year for foreign postage)
Single copy: $4.00 plus postage:
30¢ domestic 40¢ foreign

Publication of the **Research Review of Equal Education** is made possible by a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The views expressed herein are solely those of the authors and no endorsement or support from the National Institute of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is intended or should be inferred.

MAR 9 1981

RESEARCH REVIEW OF EQUAL EDUCATION

The Education For, By, and Of Asian/Pacific Americans, II

James K. Morishima
and Donald T. Mizokawa

College of Education
University of Washington

3 Introduction

3 Community Concerns

12 Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language

13 English as a Second Language

16 Bilingual Education

22 Psychosocial Concerns

22 Assertiveness

24 Speech Anxiety

24 Frustration-Aggression

26 Asian/Pacific American Postsecondary Education

31 Conclusion

34 Works Cited

The Education For, By, and Of Asian/Pacific Americans, II

James K. Morishima and Donald T. Mizokawa

Introduction

Volume 3, Number 3/Summer 1979, of **Research Review** dealt with historical, social, and cultural issues that have crucial import to Asian/Pacific American education. In Part II, attention is directed to community and psychosocial concerns of Asian/Pacific American parents, teachers, and students in public education, as well as to Asian/Pacific American postsecondary education. Highlighted in this portion is a segment on English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education for Asian/Pacific American children. The review concludes with a synthesis and a view to the future of Asian/Pacific education, based on some present realities.

Community Concerns

What are some of the major educational issues of direct concern to the Asian/Pacific American communities? A report of the California Advisory Committee (1975) to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is illuminating in this regard. One section of this report described the mythology and stereotyping attributed to the Asian/Pacific Americans as a singular group and another section documented the demography of the diverse groups comprising the Asian/Pacific American population—the paucity of accurate information from governmental agencies notwithstanding. The third section, a compilation and a synthesis of community members' testimonies on a far-reaching range of topics, is the focus here, with particular respect to the education of a number of different groups of Asian/Pacific American peoples.

The report indicated that Chinese and Chinese American "witnesses felt that all levels of education—preschool through higher education—were at issue" (p. 21). Not only are day care and preschool opportunities severely restricted, with some centers in San Francisco reporting waiting lists of more than 500 youngsters, but the lack of access to equal educational opportunity pervaded all strata of education. One symptom of denied access due to lack of facilities was related to language abilities of immigrant children

who are tested for academic proficiency in a non-native language—English.

Testimony from one witness included this citation from a teachers' manual:

> Since our main objective is to help the students develop the ability to function in English, ESL [English as a Second Language] teachers have to be aware of the native languages of their children. *But the courses must be conducted in English; the native languages don't have to be used at all* (p. 23, emphasis added).

Given a child who has limited proficiency in the language of instruction, academic achievement, if possible at all, is attained through a major additional effort not required of native speakers of English. The situation is unreasonable, especially in certain school districts with large numbers of Chinese and Chinese American students, but untenable even in a district with only one non-English-speaking child where no support services or resources are available. And one witness reported on this same phenomenon in higher education, as well.

The importance to the Chinese American community of equal access to education cannot be underrated or underestimated. In 1973, a class action suit against the San Francisco Unified School District resulted in a Supreme Court ruling in favor of the plaintiffs, who charged that the school district failed to provide access to education by neglecting appropriate instruction for Chinese-language speakers (for a more thorough accounting, see Wang, 1974 and 1976. A more detailed exposition of the far-reaching effects of this case appears later in this presentation). This case, *Lau* v. *Nichols*, 1974, provided major impetus in the development of federally assisted bilingual educational programs in all fifty states for major languages, not just Chinese (and note that the "Chinese language" has at least two major forms, the spoken modes of which are incomprehensible between different speech communities).

The dearth of Chinese American academic models and advocates in school administration was another issue raised by those offering testimony to the California Advisory Committee. In the San Diego Unified School District in 1973, there was only one Asian American administrator out of a total 407, or a ratio of 0.2 percent, according to the report. Yet, the "Asian American students comprised 3.6 percent of the total enrollment of 124,534" (p. 24). One teacher from a public school in San Francisco reported that:

> In 1972, 14.9 percent of the district's students were Chinese . . . . Chinese Americans constituted 5.4 percent of the teaching staff, 3.9 percent of the field administrative staff, and only 1.4 percent of the central office administrative staff. (p. 24)

Since the importance of adult models in children's learning has been clearly established (see the section on "Social Issues" in **Research Review**, Vol. 3, No. 3), the underrepresentation of Chinese Americans on professional staffs—whether the result of design or oversight—remains a fundamental educational and psychological issue (see also Chin, 1972). In addition, Yee (1976a, 1976b) presented data showing the paucity of Asian American students completing doctorates in education, in comparison with other academic fields. Indeed, as the California Advisory Committee report stated, the problem goes from preschool to postsecondary education.

Testimony to the California Advisory Committee from Guamanian American community members revealed that they, too, felt the educational establishment has neglected to serve their needs as Asian/Pacific Americans. The report indicated that schoolteachers and schoolmates stigmatized Guamanian American children "because of their physical characteristics, dress, mannerisms, and language" (p. 32). As noted in Part I, Brophy and Good's (1974) survey of research on the self-fulfilling prophecy would predict deleterious consequences to the child as a result of such preconceived notions and attitudes. The Guamanian American community also expressed concern that Guamanian American educational personnel were notably absent in the schooling of these youngsters.

Commentary from the Japanese American community also revealed underrepresentation of Japanese Americans at higher and higher levels of educational attainment. The report provided two sources of information on enrollment and employment data for Asian Americans at the University of California, Berkeley, which demonstrated that there were:

> 2,224 or 12.8 percent Asian American Undergraduates and 421 or 5.1 percent Asian American graduate students; 313 or 5.9 percent Asian American academic employees and 368 or 7.0 percent Asian American career staff. (p. 38)

The higher the level of academic achievement, therefore, the lower the proportions of Asian Americans who achieved. (In addition, Connor, 1975a, reported that Japanese American males had lower grades than non-Japanese American males pursuing the same college majors—a denial of the Model Minority Syndrome.)

Another concern disclosed by the Japanese American community in testimony before the California Advisory Committee related to the steadily increasing rate of school dropouts among Japanese American students. Regarding curriculum and policy decisions, they also voiced consternation at the lack of consideration of the role of Asian Americans in the history of the United States.

Similar concerns were reported by the Korean American com-

munity—i.e., the lack of bilingual and ESL support programs for speakers of Korean, daycare and preschool facilities staffed by non-speakers of Korean (leading one community to form its own school, which has been severely hampered by financial strains), and inadequacy of curriculum for Korean American children. The staffing issue also emerged. One witness said that in a district with about a thousand Korean students, only one of the 2,300 teachers was Korean.

The Pilipino Americans, too, shared most of these plights. A common observation was that neglect of Pilipino culture and history, along with insensitivity to Pilipino American language, and social and academic needs, contributed to the disenchantment of Pilipino and Pilipino American youth with public schooling. The result: a high attrition rate related to negative self-concepts. Indeed, Agcaoili (1974) reported that approximately 80 percent of Philippine-born young people in America fail to complete high school. The magnitude of problems faced by Pilipino Americans can be estimated by Borje's (1974) data that showed Pilipinos in 1973 comprised the second largest immigrant group in the United States, surpassed in number only by Mexicans.

The list of educational complaints and difficulties was echoed by members of the Samoan American community. One statement given by a representative of a Samoan youth panel embodied the concerns of all of the Asian/Pacific American peoples:

> Samoan children in particular are being deprived of their right to an education by a system which was designed by and for middle-class whites. *This system lacks the flexibility to adjust to groups because of economic conditions, language, color, cultural heritage, and outlook.* (p. 57; emphasis added)

The peoples who are called Asian/Pacific Americans have diverse cultural and national origins in America, but their perspective on education has a singular, crystalline quality: dearth. Dearth of Asian/Pacific American models, dearth of accurate Asian/Pacific American representations in curriculum and learning materials, dearth of adequate academic instruction for speakers of Asian/Pacific languages—dearth.

Why are there relatively few Asian/Pacific American professionals in education? Their scarcity has been documented. Yee (1976a, 1976b) tabulated the frequency of doctoral dissertations in education and educational research written by Asians and Asian Americans between 1905 and 1960. Virtually none were reported. Among the reasons that Yee speculated were contributors to the paucity of Asian Americans in education were:

1. The absence of deliberate recruitment of Asian Americans (1976a).

2. Greater aptitude and interest in other professional areas (1976a, 1976b).
3. Asian American men's avoidance of the sterotypically feminine field of education (1976a, 1976b).
4. Institutional racism in a profession where social and verbal interactions are rewarded more often than objective and concrete technical or technological merit (1976a, 1976b).
5. Attraction to professions affording greater social standing and prestige in an attempt to counteract ethnic minority status (1976b).

Ample evidence of motives to avoid an occupation requiring highly verbal interpersonal relationships can be gleaned directly and indirectly from studies of personality profiles of several Asian/Pacific American ethnic groups. With regard to deference to peers and authority figures, the following researchers, among others, found higher rates of deference, need for abasement, or compliance among Asian Americans than whites: Arkoff (1964); Arkoff, Meredith, and Iwahara (1962); Ayabe (1971); Connor (1974, 1975b); Diamond and Bond (1974); Fenz and Arkoff (1962); and Steward and Steward (1973). In relation to Yee's (1976a, 1976b) speculations about how these propensities might relate to occupational choice, a study by Sue and Frank (1973) is relevant. Among the findings of an investigation of psychological typologies of Chinese and Japanese American college males was that the Asian American subjects exhibited avoidance of approaches based on theoretical abstactions, low tolerance of ambiguity, preference for structure, and a predisposition to apply practical considerations in the evaluation of ideas. Also, vocational choices tended to be directed to the physical sciences and to technical and business occupations, and away from the social sciences, sales, and other verbal-linguistic areas.

An informal survey by Mizokawa found that, among one group of undergraduate Asian/Pacific American women majoring in elementary education, the most frequent reasons given for entering elementary education over secondary education included sentiments such as, "I'm not smart enough [to major in secondary education]," "I don't think I can control the big kids," "I'd have to lecture too much if I had to teach bigger kids," "I'd rather just show the children how to do things," and "I'm too small [referring to physical stature] to teach high school."

Another factor contributing to the low numbers of Asian/Pacific American professionals in education is their relatively late entry into administrative positions. With school support budgets decreasing across the nation in recent times, cuts in administrative personnel have almost invariably resulted in the attrition of low-seniority staff, especially Asian/Pacific Americans and other

ethnic minorities.

One of the most obvious reasons for the scarcity of Asian/Pacific American staff and administrators is institutional racism. Given the figures reported by witnesses to the California Advisory Committee, one interpretation is that Asian/Pacific Americans are selectively prevented from employment or promotion to administrative positions.

But whatever the antecedents, the consequences are major. Asian/Pacific American students have few adult models to identify with, emulate, and seek help from. Asian/Pacific American staff, faculty, and administrators have few colleagues to establish professional and personal support systems with. Asian/Pacific American parents find few avenues for sensitive airings of personal, social, and educational concerns. Frustration and, ultimately, alienation follow.

The views of those testifying before the California Advisory Committee are fairly representative of those expressed by Asian/Pacific Americans in the United States as a whole (51 such committees have been established, one for each state and the District of Columbia). A key understanding to be taken from the Committee's report is that, though each Asian/Pacific American group has a unique perspective, the general perspective is quite uniform. The need for adequate curriculum, student support services, and minority staffing, takes different forms for each of the ethnic groups placed in the larger category of Asian/Pacific Americans, but the need is still the same.

As for language, it was uniformly felt that academic instruction in the child's native language was necessary. Implementing a program to meet this demand requires a massive amount of organization, management, and money. In a school with a handful each of Vietnamese, Japanese, Cambodian, Samoan, Chinese, and Pilipino children, bilingual education may be pragmatically impossible, either in the present or the future.

Teaching second-grade science, for example, to twenty native speakers of English in a single class may be challenging enough for the average teacher. The typical school may be unable to present this same science content in Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Ilocano, Japanese, Cambodian, and Samoan as well. Net result: a small number of children who do not have equal access to basic academic instruction at a crucial point in their intellectual development, due to a circumstance over which they and others around them have had no choice.

An alternative approach might be to teach non-English- or limited-English-speaking children enough English to survive in the classroom. Thus, all the Asian-language-speaking children could

be placed in an English-language course until sufficient proficiency is acquired to warrant placement in the regular classroom. How long would this take? A typical seven-year-old white American child has already had seven years' head start in the acquisition of appropriate linguistic and academic skills. The non-English-speaking child has to start afresh in a new culture with new norms, and with little or no means of communicating, verbally or non-verbally.

American public education has had difficulty enough meeting the challenge of speakers of other dialects of English, let alone speakers of other, non-European languages. As a child in Hawaii, Mizokawa spoke the Hawaiian English Dialect. He had no difficulty in peer relationships; the problem he experienced was in the classroom. A typical episode:

> Teacher: Say "mouth."
> Mizokawa: "Mout."
> Teacher: "No, no! MouTH! MOUTH!"
> Mizokawa: "Mou...T!"
> Teacher: "You stupid boy! Are you deaf? The word is MOUTH!"
> Mizokawa (recalling his mother's phonology): "Mouse?"

It was no accident that the derisive laughter of the teacher preceded nearly a full year of disruptive behavior, nearly leading to his retention in the first grade another year for low language arts achievement.

The following year, his family was evicted from their tenement apartment necessitating a mid-year change of schools. On the first day in the new school, he walked into a spelling test which the new teacher required him to take, though he had not received formal instruction on the vocabulary list to be tested. He had not uttered a single word in the class the entire first day. On the second day, the teacher announced that the "new boy" had received the highest score on the spelling test. Mizokawa was then placed in the top rank based on that single performance.

The effect of the self-fulfilling prophecy with regard to language criteria has been demonstrated by other researchers and writers. What may have been atypical in this case was the sequential effect of diametrically opposed diagnoses based on single language performances. And Mizokawa spoke English, albeit a dialect; most Asian immigrant children do not even have that advantage.

The Asian/Pacific American child speaking a non-European language is at a further disadvantage. He or she does not have the "romantic" tones of French, for example, to make the accent seem "cute." For instance, some Vietnamese speakers do not perceive /l/, /n/, and /r/ phonemes in English to be mutally exclusive (Burmark & Kim, 1978), and therefore confuse them in their pro-

nunciation of English words. The apparent difficulty in saying "preliminary," therefore, might lead a teacher to assume lack of comprehension of the word when only phonological difficulty has been observed.

Whether Bilingual Education or English as a Second Language is the approach taken, the staffing problem exists, because instruction of a child is not easily separated from the child's culture. Bilingual and ESL educators must have some preparation in the Asian/Pacific American cultures for them to be sensitive to the needs of the individual child over and beyond the linguistic (and this, of course, is a must for any educator of any child). Howells and Sarabia (1978), for instance, wrote that:

> Pilipino students hold certain cultural values which may affect school behavior. These include:
>
> a. *Amor propio* (self-esteem): It is all-important to present oneself in the best possible light. This value may be expressed particularly in dress, modesty, and in manners.
>
> b. *Hiya* (shame): Pilipino children are particularly sensitive to criticism. When embarrassed the child may withdraw and become uncooperative. The teacher may be frustrated in all attempts to discover what is wrong.
>
> c. *Pakikisama* (cooperation): An emphasis on smooth interpersonal relationships may lead to cooperation at all costs in order to preserve self-esteem and gain acceptance. (p. 19)

Howells and Sarabia did offer some caveats. They noted that such descriptions of the Pilipino child are stereotypical. They added that:

> Such descriptions may be helpful at times in simplifying otherwise complex issues, but they are no substitute for the teacher getting to know both student and parents as individuals. The first and most serious difficulty with the use of generalities is that the length of time in the United States, age, previous socioeconomic and educational status of parents, and fluency in English probably all contribute to the way a child or parent fits the stereotypes described here. (p. 18)

Their use of the tentative word "may" in their description of Pilipino students attests to the lack of hard-and-fastness to their descriptions.

In the context of the present discussion, their reference to fluency in English as contributing to the degree to which a Pilipino child fits a given stereotype is relevant. Language performance not only affects how others perceive the speaker, but also the way the speaker perceives his or her place in the dominant social setting. This principle underlies the greater emphasis many educators place on English as a Second Language over Bilingual Education.

In a description of some patterns in school behavior of Vietnamese children, Burmark and Kim (1978) discussed the effect of racial prejudice on the affiliations of these children who respond by "forming cliques of their own in response to name calling and even physical abuse" (p. 5). Such affiliation "isolates them physically *as well as linguistically* from the rest of the student body" (p. 5; emphasis added). The linguistic isolation they referred to is related to, if not partly causative of, other forms of social isolation.

Some striking examples of the relation of language to socialization were presented by Burmark and Kim:

> Often the only difference between words [in Vietnamese] is . . . pitch, or tone. Consider, in ascending order, the following words as examples of tonal distinction:
>
> mà (that)
> ma (ghost)
> mạ (rice plant)
> mả (tomb)
> mã (horse)
> má (mother)
>
> The English rise in pitch to indicate a question can have no parallel in Vietnamese where tone is an intrinsic part of the individual word. For the Vietnamese person who changes yêu (love) to yếu (weak) by raising his voice, one can imagine the reluctance to raise his voice to the heights of English interrogation. (p. 7)

The social consequences of linguistic performance, therefore, are easily seen.

In the Japanese language, similar difficulties may arise in conversation. Where the Japanese *koko* means "here," *asoko* means "there," and *soko* refers to a point between *koko* and *asoko*, the English colloquial phrase "neither here nor there" may have completely unexpected meaning to the native speaker of Japanese.

Understanding and awareness of the parameters of linguistic performance may help the educator to avoid unwarranted conclusions based on language behavior. The common reaction to language comprehension difficulty, readily observed in duty-free gift shops overseas, is to raise one's voice and lower one's rate of speech as if in the belief that the listener has a hearing disability or is somewhat deficient intellectually, or both. The placement of the burden for learning on the listener denies the interactive dyadic nature of human communication, and denies the inherently *social* aspect of language use.

Language-related issues in education, therefore, are among the foremost in the list of concerns of Asian/Pacific American edu-

cation. Simply because language use is concomitant and coincidental with so many other educational foci, Asian/Pacific American educators and students have realized the paramount importance of appropriate programs adapted to linguistic needs. Again, the specific educational issue being targeted reflects the social milieu of education. The diorama represents everyone, not just the Asian/Pacific American.

Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language

Owan (1975) has projected that in 1980 alone, nearly 103,000 immigrants will arrive from the Philippines, Korea, China, and Japan. Those projections did *not* include immigrants from other areas of Asia and the Pacific Islands. Given President Carter's commitment to increase the admission of refugees from what was once French Indochina to 14,000 per month and with the inclusion of immigrants from such areas as India and the Pacific Islands, it is likely that the number of immigrants from the Asian/Pacific Island areas will exceed 300,000 in 1980. Because these newer immigrants tend to be comprised of women and children as well as men, the effect of the *Lau* v. *Nichols* (1974) United States Supreme Court decision on the various public school systems will continue to be major. School systems such as the Seattle Public Schools have had to accommodate approximately 80 new students with limited proficiency each month (Matsuda, 1980). Many of these students from Indochina are functionally illiterate in both their native languages and English, i.e., they neither read nor write either language. Schools throughout the United States have had to accommodate the needs of students with non-English speaking and limited-English proficiency (NES/LEP) and they have had to do so in an era in which there is also decreased public support for education.

Lau v. *Nichols* (1974) was a class action suit brought because no specialized programs were developed to help NES/LEP children gain proficiency in English. The United States Supreme Court declared that schools having "substantial" numbers of NES/LEP students receiving federal assistance must provide specialized educational programs designed to give NES/LEP students equal educational opportunity with their English-speaking peers. The suit was in response to the use of the immersion or the sink-or-swim method which placed students with NES/LEP in regular classrooms where the students either learned English (swam) or they failed (sank). Since there was no substantive evidence indicating that the immersion program led to English proficiency, the Supreme Court concluded that the students were not being provided equal

educational opportunity.

The implications for both Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language (ESL) embodied in the Supreme Court's decision may be illustrated by a compilation of the Asian/Pacific American languages currently being served by various bilingual programs in the United States and the Pacific Islands over which the United States has jurisdiction. The list is by no means representative of all the Asian/Pacific American languages spoken in the United States and the Pacific Islands, and it would certainly have to be expanded if the United States government again extends the diameter of the umbrella that encompasses the term, "Asian/Pacific American," as it did when India was added. There are approximately three dozen Asian/Pacific American languages represented in the various bilingual programs in the United States and its trust territories. They are presented here for illustrative purposes in alphabetical order: Cambodian, Cantonese, Carolinian, Chamorro, Chao-Chow, East Indian, Hawaiian, Hindi, Hmong, Ilocano, Indonesian, Japanese, Kopingamaragni, Korean, Kosraean, Laotian, Mandarin, Mien (Yao), Ngetikese, Nukuoroan, Palauan, Pilipino (Tagalog), Ponapean, Punjabi, Samoan, Tamir, Thai, Tongan, Trukese, Uliphian, Vietnamese, Visayan, Woleaian, and Yapese (Center for Bilingual Education, 1980).

English as a Second Language

The language of instruction in ESL, of course, is English. The curriculum is designed to bring students up to a given level of English proficiency as rapidly as possible. Dubin and Olshtain (1977) have defined ESL as a course of study that has as its immediate goal sufficient fluency in English to enable students to function effectively in all communication settings. Until recently, ESL had been generally restricted to a very few NES/LEP students in the common schools and foreign students in post-secondary institutions. With the advent of significant numbers of NES/LEP students in the classroom—or more accurately, with the recognition that there were significant numbers of LEP students in the classrooms—a number of ESL programs were implemented in the common schools. ESL was seen as a relatively cost-effective means of providing the specialized programs necessary to comply with *Lau* v. *Nichols*. It must be noted parenthetically that while there had been NES/LEP students in many classes outside of such areas as Chinatown, Little Manila, and the barrio, many teachers did not recognize the problem until the Vietnamese Resettlement Program in 1976. With the publicity received by the Resettlement Program, increasing numbers of teachers became aware of the needs of NES/LEP students. In October 1977, alone, the various ESL training programs at the University of Washington received 46 requests for technical assistance

from public school teachers in the state of Washington (Language Learning Council, 1978) Thus, many Latino and Asian/Pacific American students had been denied access to specialized programs because teachers and schools had not recognized the special problems of NES/LEP students before the Resettlement Program.

There are several problems associated with the teaching of ESL. First, in most schools the program is basically a pull-out model in which NES/LEP students are provided with ESL in concentrated practice in oral English (Parker, 1978) in specifically designed courses. This technique results in what is tantamount to segregated classrooms. That is, since most of the NES/LEP students are Third World students, i.e., Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Americans, the special English classes consist almost entirely of ethnic minorities.

Second, many states and districts have not recognized the need for trained ESL teachers. They have assumed that if a teacher teaches English, or a foreign language and is fluent in English, the teacher could teach ESL. One district in the greater Seattle area, for example, assigned ESL responsibilities to an ex-coach who had seniority in the district but who was neither trained in English nor a foreign language nor was he provided with sufficient advance notice to prepare himself for his new assignment since he was not notified until two days before the class first met. The difficulty with this philosophy was illustrated by Getz (1980) who compared the courses required for English education majors and ESL teaching majors in ten universities. She found that ESL majors were required to take courses in phonology, syntax, theories of second language acquisition, ESL teaching methods, and experience teaching NES/LEP students. Few, if any, of those course requirements applied to English education majors. The ESL majors were also required to take significantly more courses in English grammer than were English education majors. Finally, most ESL majors were also required to take foreign languages while few English education majors were required to do so. If formal training in ESL philosophy, theory, techniques, and methodology are important requisites to being effective ESL teachers, then districts are performing a disservice to NES/LEP students by not employing trained personnel.

Thus, while the Supreme Court clearly mandated special instruction for NES/LEP students in *Lau* v. *Nichols*, school districts appear not to be providing adequately for equal educational opportunity by employing trained ESL teachers. The lack of a clear school district or state policy on the qualifications of ESL teachers is particularly nettling to some Asian/Pacific American groups.

As mentioned earlier, several of the Asian/Pacific American groups are increasing rapidly because of immigration. With President Carter's public announcement that he was ordering an increase in the admission of refugees from Southeast Asia from 7,000 to 14,000

per month for one year, it is clear that a great many refugees will be entering the United States from that sector of Asia alone. Matsuda's (1980) estimate of 80 new NES/LEP students each month for the Seattle Public Schools may, for example, be translated into the need for approximately three to four new classrooms to accommodate immigrants from Southeast Asia every month.

The 1970 Census estimated that there were 65,000 to 70,000 Korean Americans in the United States (Bureau of the Census, 1973). If 70,000 is taken as the 1970 base and if Owan's (1975) estimate of 400,000 Korean American immigrants between 1970 and 1980 is accepted, this means an increase in this one Asian/Pacific American group of 330,000. It may be assumed that the lion's share of the population increase will be due to factors other than births, i.e., to immigration. It is likely that at least 75 percent of the additional Korean Americans recorded in the 1980 Census will be immigrants and that 90-95 percent of the Korean American children will be either immigrants or the American-born children of immigrants. Virtually all of the Korean American children, then, might be classified as NES/LEP and in need of special English programs such as ESL since the language spoken at home is very likely to be Korean.

Third, ESL has as its primary goal the mastery of English. The result is that the student receives concentrated English instruction in the ESL classes but participates for the remainder of the school day in the regular programs (Parker, 1978). Until the students' English skills are sufficiently good to enable them to understand the content of the other subject matter, e.g., social studies, it is likely that they will fall behind their English-speaking classmates. The resulting deficit in subject matter mastery may or may not be remediable. But, as Parker (1978) pointed out, the question of mastering subject matter is assumed to be resolvable once the student has facility with English.

One also wonders what the school world sounds like to the Pilipino-speaking child. The child is surrounded by English-speaking peers in the regular program and by other non-English speaking peers (e.g., Korean-speaking, Hindu-speaking, and Tamir-speaking) in ESL classes. The world must be chaotic and bewildering until the child begins to understand English. Whether the ESL training will "take hold" rapidly enough to enable a child to play "catch up" in subject matter content successfully and to bring order to the linguistic chaos quickly are, of course, empirical questions. Informal interaction with university students who were once NES/LEP students in the common schools reveals that they were terribly frustrated and alienated until their mastery of English enabled them to understand their school environments.

Fourth, many ESL teachers have not been trained to utilize the unique opportunity of the classroom to promote the goals of cultural pluralism. That is, in general, there is not major concern with incul-

cating in students from a variety of cultures a fuller appreciation of all of those cultures. Parker (1978) noted that the focus of ESL is on the assimilation of students with minimal attention being paid to the NES/LEP students' "home language or culture (although this trend may be changing owing to recent emphases on multi-cultural education)" (p. 10). The incorporation of a student's home culture in a class comprised solely of English-speaking students is difficult in and of itself (see, for example, Banks, 1979) without including the factor of language differences. If language difficulties for recent Asian/Pacific American immigrants leads to an increased probability that the student will become more alienated, encounter anomie, and the like, it may be even more critical to find a mechanism to incorporate the student's home culture into the curriculum. For Asian/Pacific American students, the innovative teacher in an ESL class may be able to incorporate the works of Asian/Pacific novelists (e.g., Mishima) in English translations as well as Asian/Pacific American writers (e.g., Chin, Chan, Inada, and Wong, 1974; Bulosan, 1946; Inada, 1971; and Santos, 1979). It is our view that the classroom teacher should make every effort to assist the Asian/Pacific NES/LEP students in the acculturation process by utilizing the resources available in written and unwritten forms. The confusion engendered by language barriers may be vitiated, in part, by insuring that the student is exposed to materials which reflect his/her cultural background and the cultures the student is likely to enter.

Finally, most of the students ESL teachers are likely to face in the classroom will be Third World. It may, then, also be important for the teachers to be exposed to the literature on learning and cognitive styles. Harris (1979), for example, speculated in her dissertation that Asian/Pacific Americans may have an external locus of control, i.e., that Asian/Pacific American students may be more prone to see their lives controlled by factors external to themselves. Such students may be more prone to the influence of peers and teachers than are other types of students. There may be important implications in this phenomenon for the general classroom and the ESL classroom which should be further explored and exploited. The externally controlled students may be more likely to take criticism more seriously than students with internal locus of control. Thus, a teacher may wish to take special steps to minimize the degree to which students tease and/or criticize Asian/Pacific American students.

Bilingual Education

Vazquez (1976) indicated that:

With the passage of the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of ESEA, bilingual education became a national reality in 1968, triggering programmatic activity in this educational process throughout the country. This act recognizes the needs and strengths of

children with limited English speaking ability in our schools and provides funds for the implementation of bilingual education programs. Since its enactment, other federal and state legislation has been passed to broaden the scope and extent of bilingual education. (p. 23)

The federal government has provided funding for the establishment of bilingual education programs at both the common school and post-secondary education levels. In addition to providing funds for teacher training, the Office of Bilingual Education provided funds for such activities as assessment, dissemination, and technical assistance.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1971) defined bilingual education as: the use of two languages—English and the native language of the child—as the media of instruction in a well-organized program which encompassed all or part of the school curriculum; concern for the study of the history and culture associated with the native language of the child; and concern with the child's self concept and pride.

As a result of federal sanction in 1968, "bilingual education programs serving numerous language groups have multiplied across the country as federal, state, and local funds have been allocated to this purpose" (Parker, 1977, p. vii). The use of two languages in instruction for any or all of the school curriculum enables NES/LEP students to master subject matter (e.g., social studies), while simultaneously beginning the mastery of English (Anderson and Boyer, 1970). As such, bilingual education goes beyond the classroom practices one sees in ESL. Unlike ESL the student can progress with the mastery of subject matter while simultaneously mastering English. Unlike the immersion approach, the student can progress with the mastery of subject matter, begin mastering English, and begin bringing order to the surrounding school environment. The focus, then, is on both the mastery of English and of subject matter, and upon the self concept and pride of the individual student.

Unlike many teachers of ESL, most bilingual teachers take the opportunity to maximize the goals of cultural pluralism by exposing students to a fuller appreciation of both the American culture and the culture from which the target language originated. In classes where there are English-dominant students as well as LEP students, both groups can learn about the cultures of the others. In short, "bicultural" education.

The major difficulty we have with the concept of "bicultural education" is that for Asian/Pacific Americans, the term should really be "multi-cultural education." That is, bicultural education implies two cultures—American and "other." In consonance with our earlier concerns about the confusion of Asian/Pacific and Asian/Pacific

American cultures, it is necessary to expand the concept of bicultural education to more adequately reflect the reality of life in the United States for Asian/Pacific American bilingual/multi-cultural education. That is, while the language of instruction would be Cantonese and English, the child would also be exposed to Cantonese culture, Chinese American culture, Asian/Pacific American culture and "American" culture. There are differences between the four in terms of norms and mores and the child should be exposed to them all. Exposure to Cantonese culture may be necessary to enable the child to interact with parents, relatives, and others who have immigrated from the Cantonese-speaking area of China. The Chinese American cultural values are necessary for the child to be able to interact with the descendants of immigrants from that area of China who have resided in the United States for several years (if not generations). The Asian/Pacific American cultural exposure is necessary for the child to be able to interact with others who are ethnically similar. The importance of learning about "American" culture is obvious.

There are several problems associated with bilingual education. First, like ESL, there is a lack of a trained cadre. While several programs have been designed to overcome this weakness, because of the necessity of having bilingual teachers many schools have been relying upon non-certificated personnel who serve as teaching aides. For example, in one school district in the state of Alaska there are no certificated teachers who are bilingual. The bilingual aspect of the Title VII funded program is provided by teachers' aides. Of the eight teachers' aides, only one completed high school. In the state of Washington, one district utilizing Title VII funding employs three individuals in their Vietnamese bilingual program. None of the three is certificated, they are all teachers' aides. None of the three is a college graduate. None of the three is truly bilingual, either, they each have some trouble with complete comprehension of English (Anonymous, 1980).

Second, because of the very nature of bilingual education, it is extremely difficult for schools to have cost-effective programs. That is, with the exception of schools located in barrios, Chinatowns, and the like, one usually does not find a sufficient number of students at a particular grade level who speak the same language to have efficient programs. Even those schools that do have sufficient numbers of students from the same linguistic backgrounds are beginning to be hard-pressed to maintain bilingual programs because of forced desegregation.

Third, there is a level of confusion about the effective use to which bilingual funds are put. Anonymous (1980) reported that in one school district which had 16 "bilingual" classrooms for Cantonese dominant LES/NEP students, five utilized only ESL (instruction in English only), seven utilized bilingual teachers' aides to supplement

non-bilingual teachers, two relied on special tutors for LES/NEP students exclusively, and one had a trained bilingual teacher but she also had Mandarin-dominant and Korean-dominant LES/NEP students in her bilingual class which was designed for Cantonese-dominant students. In that particular classroom, two bilingual teachers' aides were utilized for the non-Cantonese-dominant LES/NEP students. Given the extensive use of teachers' aides in some of the programs and the variations in the nature of "bilingual" programs, it would be surprising if the American Institutes for Research (1978) analyses had reported positive results for bilingual programs. (The fact that a program is labeled "bilingual" does not mean that it is, in fact, bilingual.)

Fourth, because of a dearth of well-controlled, well-conceived research, bilingual education has come under increasing criticism. Without research to explore, for example, alternative service delivery mechanisms, the lack of cost effectiveness will ultimately result in the elimination of bilingual programs when subsidies from the federal government are withdrawn. The exploration of alternate service delivery mechanisms is especially critical for the Asian/Pacific American communities. Not all Asian/Pacific American immigrant families are located in Asian/Pacific American population centers such as Chinatowns. That is, many Asian/Pacific American families may be found living throughout an urban area (see, for example, Chao, 1977; Schmid, Nobbe, and Mitchell, 1968, pp. 64, 66, and 67). If Asian/Pacific American families do not live exclusively in a given urban area, and if the families have NES/LEP children (Matsuda, 1980), then the provision of bilingual programs may be economically feasible if and only if effective alternative service delivery mechanisms are found. Can, for example, bilingual education be provided for NES/LEP students via closed circuit television, micro-computers, and CB radio?

Fifth, there is continuing controversy among the advocates of bilingual education as to whether bilingual education should serve a maintenance function or a facilitation function.

For the Asian/Pacific American communities, the major concern with bilingual education is that of maintenance vs. facilitation. The maintenance function of bilingual education, simply put, is to enable a child to maintain and improve upon his/her mother tongue. The intent of such a program, then, would be to enable a Guamanian American who speaks Chamorro to learn English and to maintain or improve upon his/her command of Chamorro as well. There is, in general, little support for the maintenance function of bilingual education in the Asian/Pacific American communities. Most of the resistance of parents to having their children placed in bilingual education programs, in fact, appears to stem from an assumption that bilingual programs serve a maintenance function (Dang, 1977; Chang, 1978).

The facilitation function of bilingual education is much more consonant with the prevailing mood in the Asian/Pacific American communities. Here, the purpose is to allow the student sufficient time and encouragement to attain a minimal competency level in English while simultaneously mastering other subject matter. Once a student is able to function in English sufficiently well to continue mastering other subject matter, the emphasis is placed on ESL to further refine the student's ability to communicate in English with native-like fluency. The prevailing attitude in the Asian/Pacific American communities appears to be that if a parent wishes to have a child maintain his/her command of the mother tongue, the parents will see to it that the child learns that language at home or in special language schools (Chang, 1978).

The attitude toward both bilingual education and ESL in the Asian/Pacific American communities, then, is generally one of support. Bilingual education must be a bridge program that facilitates the transition of the student from limited English proficiency to English proficiency. The role of ESL is to enable the student to gain better control of English. The intent, then, is to maximize the student's chances of success in the greater American society once the student's education is completed.

For either or both programs to survive, however, basic research must be undertaken and the ESL and bilingual teachers must be trained to recognize and appreciate "empirical questions." We cannot long afford to have empirical questions dismissed because the alternatives are dissonant from the teachers' viewpoints. It is, for example, unfortunate that many ESL and bilingual teachers bring with them a strong prejudice against B.F. Skinner's (1957) approach. While his analysis might be criticized (see, for example, Chomsky, 1959), the ESL and bilingual teachers may be well-advised to look closely at the Skinnerian approach and attempt to apply such principles as shaping, successive approximation, reinforcement contingencies, and fading.

Empirical studies must be conducted on the academic level at which specialized language programs need to be implemented. Is it possible, for example, that immersion programs provide optimal results in grades K-3, ESL in grades 4-6, bilingual programs in grades 7-9, and bilingual programs supplemented by ESL in grades 10-12? Is it possible that for students with certain characteristics English may be learned "best" by having them read "good" literature? Is it necessary to teach students the rules and structure of English grammar? For Third World students, is it desirable to work toward the complete elimination of accents? What are the personality and other characteristics of individuals who have little or no accent when they learned English after puberty? For Asian/Pacific American NES/LEP students, is there a mechanism to encourage the students to verbalize more in the classroom? Are there effective mechanisms to maximize the proba-

bilities of a "ripple" effect, i.e., to have the NES/LEP students help their surrogates learn English?

The answers to such empirical questions could well lead to a restructuring and a deeper understanding of the roles of immersion, ESL, and bilingual programs. In addition, the research activities can lead to a deeper understanding of other factors that should be considered under the guise of cost-effectiveness and accountability. Of paramount importance, however, is that exploring empirical questions almost always leads the teacher to question some of the basic implicit assumptions embodied in the approach(es) used in the classroom with "an eyeball being constantly peeled" to find more efficient and effective methods for maximizing the educational experiences of the students.

One of the disconcerting factors in bilingual education, for example, is the tendency to concentrate resources at the elementary education level. In most school districts this leads inevitably to a major decrease in cost-effectiveness. Primary schools serve smaller catchment areas than do middle or junior high schools which, in turn, serve smaller catchment areas than do senior high schools. In turn, the size of the catchment area has implications for the number of LEP students with a given linguistic background likely to be enrolled in a given school. Thus, while a high school may have 35 Tongan-speaking LEP students, a junior high school may have 15, while a primary school may have three. For cost-effectiveness, one should obviously concentrate resources at the senior high school level. But what are the educational implications of such a policy? Do we *really* need bilingual education at the primary levels? (That, obviously, is an empirical question.)

The implications of placing special linguistic resources at schools with small catchment areas for the Asian/Pacific American communities are obvious (Chao, 1977; Schmid, et al., 1968). In the absence of strong empirical evidence about the efficacy of bilingual education and with decreasing federal support, schools will inevitably move from bilingual education to ESL. (The merit of that transition is, of course, still another empirical question.) In turn, this could well mean that Asian/Pacific American children will not have access to equal educational opportunity.

Finally, it is unfortunate but true that with the implemenation of desegregation programs, the number of LEP students in given buildings is likely to diminish radically—leading to less cost-effective programs. While one may debate the merits of utilizing cost-effectiveness as a criterion, the mood in government today appears to be one of accountability and cost-effectiveness is employed in determining accountability.

Psychosocial Concerns

Given the tendency of Asian/Pacific Americans to be located in a variety of areas resulting in part from voluntary residential patterns and in part from such factors as the Vietnamese Resettlement Program, it is clear that Asian/Pacific American children may be found in a wide variety of different schools. We have already discussed the "positive" stereotyping of Asian/Pacific American children by many school teachers (for other implications, see Elliott, 1970; and Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968). While we are hesitant to discuss behavioral tendencies on the part of Asian/Pacific American children lest it lead to stereotyping, we have nonetheless chosen to do so. We feel compelled, however, to reiterate that the within-group variance (within culture A and within culture B) may be greater than the between-group variance (between cultures A and B). Any generalized discussion, then, may be of a factor that many Asian/Pacific American children possess and many other Asian/Pacific American children do not possess.

Assertiveness

There is considerable evidence (see, for example, Hsu, 1972; Kitano, 1976; and Sue and Sue, 1971) that the Chinese and Japanese cultures reinforce nonassertive behaviors particularly in the presence of authority figures and that the propensity for nonassertiveness has been maintained as a part of the evolving Chinese and Japanese American cultures. Indeed, the nonassertive, passive, quiet stereotype is so pervasive that Hosokawa (1969) sub-titled his book on Japanese Americans "The Quiet Americans." The literature for Japanese Americans, for example, is replete with the analyses of such cultural constructs as *enryo, hazukashi, hi-ge, amae, on,* and *giri* and their implications for the personalities of Japanese Americans (see, for example, Arkoff, Meredith, and Iwahara, 1962; Benedict, 1946; Doi, 1962; Kitano, 1976; Meredith, 1966; and Petersen, 1966).

To the extent that Japanese American children have learned those behaviors and attitudes, we may expect to find them acted out in the classroom. As a consequence ESL teachers, for example, report that when they deal with Iranians and Arabs there is no difficulty in getting verbal exchanges started but getting Asian/Pacific students started is "like pulling teeth." An Asian/Pacific American student may find it difficult to volunteer in class, to lead class discussions, to initiate action, to be critical of "authority figures," and the like, much as his/her Asian/Pacific counterpart encounters difficulties. The child may have learned that it is an exhibition of arrogance to be assertive and may suffer from culture conflict when he/she learns that assertiveness is an expected behavior.

Callao (1973) reported that many Asian/Pacific American stu-

dents had great personal difficulty making even simple requests of teachers. Hutchinson, Arkoff, and Weaver (1966) reported that white Americans were observed to have a significantly higher rate of classroom responsiveness than Japanese American students at the University of Hawaii. They found that the Japanese American students did not appear uncomfortable with their low responsiveness or performance and exhibited a tendency to follow rather than lead. In addition, the Japanese American students exhibited a high deference pattern. These results are also consistent with one of the recurring problems reported in the School of Nursing at the University of Washington. The nursing faculty found that while Asian/Pacific American students performed well in laboratory and clinic courses, their performance in seminars and practica where students are expected to exchange views with one another tends to be poor. The Asian/Pacific American students tend to exhibit a propensity for silence. In short, many Asian/Pacific American students appear to find it difficult to be assertive in classroom settings. One might even go so far as to speculate that because assertiveness is so dissonant from their Asian/Pacific American cultural values, those who are assertive may well be either bicultural, i.e., have learned to function well in both the Asian/Pacific American culture and the dominant culture, or more highly assimilated. It is, perhaps, ironic that in order to advocate for the rights of one's ethnicity and personal and group rights, the Asian/Pacific American activist must often foresake his/her ethnic heritage. As Sue (1977) indicated, "to have the right to be nonassertive . . . perhaps it is necessary to become assertive" (p. 388).

When Sue (1977) asked a group of 60 Asian/Pacific American students if they would be interested in participating in an assertiveness training program, more than 90 percent responded affirmatively. Unfortunately, to be more assertive also appears to conflict with the self-denying, self-effacing, "the whole is more than the sum of its parts" value system so deeply ingrained in many Asian/Pacific Americans. Rather than denying the needs of the self, an individual must become a "freer self," a self that affirms its own needs to take the attitude that "the whole is merely the sum of its parts." Another conflict arises when one scans books and articles dealing with assertiveness training. One mechanism to demonstrate one's assertiveness is to look directly at another person and maintain eye contact while conveying one's message in a straightforward, honest, and assertive manner. The maintenance of eye contact, however, is not a desirable behavior in many cultures. Many Asian/Pacific Americans have learned that the maintenance of eye contact is a sign of disrespect and they feel very uncomfortable when asked to do so or when others do so to them. We have heard an Asian/Pacific American professor report that it took him five years of constant, conscious effort before he was able to maintain eye contact with students and colleagues. But when he interacts

with other Asian/Pacific Americans, he has noted that his newly ingrained eye contact behavior consistently disappears without conscious effort.

Speech Anxiety

One common observation among educators is that Asian/Pacific Americans tend to be verbally inhibited. Asian/Pacific Americans often do not speak out in classes and when they do speak, there is often difficulty in articulating, it is asserted. The problem does not appear to be one of language facility since American-born Asian/Pacific Americans tend to exhibit this tendency to an almost equal degree as do immigrants. Neither does the problem appear to be caused by a lack of novel ideas, interesting insights, or intelligent thoughts. The problem seems to have its roots in personality or situational variables. Shyness, speech anxiety, conformity to authority figures (and teachers are authority figures), and reserve are frequently attributed to Asian/Pacific Americans.

Ayabe (1971) observed that Japanese Americans participated less in classroom discussions than their white American peers. Reduced levels of verbal expression by Japanese American students, it was reasoned, may be attributed to either their greater deference to authority figures or a physical inability to speak as loudly as white Americans. An experimental study was designed. Using female subjects, Ayabe tested subjects with a professor-experimenter and a coed-experimenter. The results indicated no physical differences in the capacity to produce loud speech. It is argued that lower Japanese American decibel levels resulted from the inhibition inherent in the presence of authority figures.

Frustration-Aggression

One extensively researched theory of aggression postulates that "aggression is always a consequence of frustration" and the "frustration always leads to some form of aggression" (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears, 1939, p. 1). Dollard, et al., suggested that direct physical and verbal aggression will be the most preferred types of behavior following frustration. While no direct evidence on our hypothesis is available, we shall utilize our knowledge of Asian/Pacific American culture and personality, and our intuition and observation to speculate on a variant of the frustration-aggression theory which has implications for the classroom teacher.

We have already cited ample literature that would lead one to expect that Asian/Pacific American students should have a high state of frustration: stereotyping by teachers and fellow students;

false expectations; a psychologically based aversion to being assertive and verbal while cognitvely knowing one should; a feeling of "minority-ness" while facing the success story stereotype; an inability to understand the nuances of very basic English by the immigrant students; all contribute to this expectation. One wonders why the level of presumed frustration should not lead to more instances of overt physical and verbal aggression in the classroom.

The majority of studies based on the frustration-aggression hypothesis have indicated a positive relationship between the degree of frustration and the level of expressed aggression. At the risk of major oversimplification of the results: the higher the level of frustration, the higher the aggression. However, given the Asian/Pacific American cultural characteristics of reticence, non-assertiveness, and respect for authority, it is highly unlikely that such a relationship between frustration and aggression would exist for Asian/Pacific Americans. We would speculate that for many Asian/Pacific Americans, frustration may increase without a concommitant increase in aggression until a threshhold is reached. Once the threshhold is crossed, there is an exponential increase in aggressive behavior—an explosion. If this speculation is correct, the implications for the classroom are clear. We must know how to determine the level of frustration, and take appropriate measures to reduce the frustration or suffer the consequences. Alternatively, we can attempt to teach Asian/Pacific American children how to deal more effectively with frustration while simultaneously realizing that to do so may lead to a conflict with deeply ingrained cultural values. A third strategy, of course, is to strive to prevent frustration.

As educators who also happen to be Asian/Pacific Americans, we find ourselves being consulted by teachers who discuss the asocial behavior of many of the Asian/Pacific American immigrant children. Careful questioning often leads to the following reported scenario: good behavior, better behavior, explosion. "Better behavior" is typically defined in terms of a decrease in the number of problems for the teacher. A quiet child who does not fight with other children is well-behaved. A polite child is well-behaved.

Our speculation is that as an Asian/Pacific American gets frustrated, the frustration tends to be channelled inward. As the internalized frustration increases, hostility develops. The hostility then gets expressed in a manner that is socially acceptable and understood in the Asian/Pacific American community. Unfortunately, the socially acceptable and appropriate mechanism to express hostility and anger is often misinterpreted by the teacher. The misinterpretation and subsequent lack of corrective action by the teacher simply exacerbates the situation and the internalized frustration and hostility increase until, ultimately, there is an explosion.

The key for the teacher (besides insisting on having a bilingual teacher's aide or an ESL program) is to focus on behavioral change. It may be insufficient for the teacher to attend only to increases in socially undesirable behavior as indicators of potential trouble since different cultures may express hostility differently. In the case of many Asian/Pacific American children, the teacher would be well-advised to be concerned equally with increases in "good" behavior if there is reason to doubt that the student's frustration level has not been decreased. In short, in some Asian/Pacific American cultures an increase in politeness is the result of increased hostility and frustration. The aggression is expressed by subtle changes in behavior that are patently obvious in the community but which are, unfortunately, not cues for most teachers.

Asian/Pacific American Postsecondary Education

Asian/Pacific American Studies programs in higher education have not generally been the subject of as intense public and bureaucratic attention as has been Asian/Pacific American public education. The reasons are myriad, but include the long-standing set of traditions impinging on the academic disciplines in a university setting, and the exemption of public institutions of higher education from compulsory attendance laws (making ethnic issues a much lesser concern in public postsecondary education than at the elementary and secondary levels). Yet, according to Kagiwada and Fujimoto (1973), many of the problems found in Asian American Studies in the colleges "have their roots in the public education system" (p. 404), at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. For this reason, a closer look at Asian/Pacific American Studies in institutions of higher education is warranted in any discussion of Asian/Pacific American education.

Asian/Pacific American ethnic studies programs in colleges and universities were catalyzed into existence by the Third World strikes in 1968 (Endo, 1973; Kagiwada and Fujimoto, 1973). Although most university programs originated under the title of "Asian-American Studies" (with the hyphen), a number have evolved the more contemporary nomenclature that deletes the hypen (see *Research Review*, Vol. 3, No. 3) and adds recognition of Pacific Island Americans—hence, "Asian/Pacific American Studies."[1]

1. As a matter of fact, more and more writers have begun to consistently use the Asian/Pacific American reference, leading to the slow demise of allusions to the A-A (Asian-American) or the AA (Asian American). One awkward outcome of this new convention has been in the form of acronyms with an abundance of letters. For example, NAAPAE is the acronym for the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, now in its third year and with its second official name (the first name, National Association for Asian American and Pacific Education—NAAAPE—did not designate Pacific Islanders as Americans). Similarly, the Asian Student Division of the Office of Minority Affairs at the University of Washington is now known as the Asian/Pacific American Student Division.

A common goal of Asian/Pacific American Studies programs has been to foster educational reform (Endo, 1973; Kagiwada and Fujimoto, 1973). Not surprisingly, there have been some difficulties. Lack of specialists in the many areas of ethnic history and culture prevent full-scale implementation. The near impossibility of obtaining a Vietnamese American professor with social science training to teach an introductory course on Vietnamese Americans, for example, is a case in point. Acknowledging the inclusion of Pacific Island Americans in Asian American Studies has been a similar problem. One program offers an annual seminar on Asian Americans in Hawaii in recognition of the unusual ethnic composition of the state, where there is no ethnic majority, only minorities, but the person teaching the course is a Japanese American educational psychologist whose training and research has primarily been in psycholinguistics.

The issue of staffing is exemplified in the broad spectrum of faculty sizes at many universities and colleges with Asian/Pacific American Studies programs. From a national survey of major programs, Nakanishi and Leong (1978) found:

> In terms of the staff size, distinct differences exist between three Asian American Studies programs (CSU San Francisco, UCLA, and UC Berkeley) and the other eleven programs [seven other California campuses, University of Washington, University of Colorado, City College of New York, and University of Hawaii]. These three schools account for 62 percent (111/180) of all Asian American staff members of the fourteen surveyed campuses; 51 percent (25/49) of full-time and 66 percent (86/131) of part-time . . . . The other eleven programs average 6.3 total staff members, of which on the average 2.2 are full-time and 4.1 are part-time. Three programs (University of Colorado, UC Santa Barbara, CSU San Jose) do not have any full-time staff members, and three (University of Southern California, CSU Fresno, and University of Hawaii) have only one full-time staff person. (pp. 3-4)

These figures are interesting by comparison to the staffing of other, more "traditional" academic programs at the same universities that often have many times more full-time staff with the same or smaller numbers of students enrolled in their courses.

A major issue with relevance to the staffing of Asian/Pacific American Studies is, as in public education, the dearth of American-born faculty of Asian descent. Suzuki (1980) cited a study indicating that only ten percent of Asians in postsecondary education are, in fact, American-born. Along with the situation of Asian faculty member's being in engineering and the physical sciences, Suzuki concluded that the relative size of Asian faculty groups is presently irrelevant to Asian American Studies. Therefore, one rec-

ommendation that Suzuki offered was that attempts to identify Asian/Pacific American faculty with qualifications in both Asian/Pacific American Studies and one of the social sciences or humanities be intensified. With such university and student recruitment efforts increasing, new Asian/Pacific American faculty could then teach part-time in the Asian/Pacific American Studies program as well as in their home department.

But there are elements in the future of higher education that prevent ready implementation of such a plan. Nakanishi (1980) noted that, in California,

> [there] are two significant demographic trends which are headed in opposite directions, and will have a tug-of-war effect on Asian American Studies: first, the overall *decline* in total student enrollments and, second, the substantial *increase* in the number of minority students, especially Asian and Pacific Americans . . . . (p. 4)

With shrinking support and increasing inflationary pressures, the decrease in total student attendance at many public universities may result in the smaller programs being eliminated first on any campus; among the smallest tend to be the ethnic studies departments. Such a prospect is faced by many state universities, and not just those in California that Nakanishi primarily referred to. Besides, according to Kashima (1980), given the present and future realities, "It would be unwise . . . to expect the future receptivity [toward] and nurturance of AAS [Asian American Studies] to increase" (p. 8) in the decade of the 80's. No-growth budgets which hold dollar allocations constant in the face of the erosion of their value do not allow for the growth of Asian/Pacific American Studies, at least through normal channels. Non-university public or private funding for research and development project may be a partial solution to the fiscal crisis in ethnic studies, but, with small faculties, procurement of such funds may be inordinately difficult.

What are the consequences of dwindling or marginally viable Asian/Pacific American Studies programs for public education? First and foremost, resource materials and training experiences will become less and less available as needs for socioethnic training grow. Preservice teachers will not have the opportunities to become sensitized to Asian/Pacific Americans in their future classrooms. Inservice teachers would have little chance to develop increased ethnic awareness and information through continuing education. Researchers and scholars—both ethnic and non-ethnic—will have few opportunities for consultation with Asian/Pacific American Studies and related faculty. And Asian/Pacific Americans pursuing a search for personal identity will have no formal channels for self-growth. (Nakanishi and Leong, 1980, stated that almost all of the Asian/Pacific American Studies programs they surveyed

reported that the majority of students in the undergraduate courses were Asian Americans.) The ripples will spread far across the entire educational system before they cease having an effect.

Ultimately, the consumers of education will be the losers, if Asian/Pacific American Studies at the postsecondary institutions dwindle. They will be served by educators who have not formally acquired sensitivity to cultural influences on classroom behaviors and achievement patterns. Their teachers may be monocultural persons ineffectively dealing with a multicultural classroom reality. Students speaking an Asian language will be taught by persons speaking a strange tongue but will be expected to perform at a level comparable to classmates who need no language training. And the Asian/Pacific Americans who speak English will still feel inordinate amounts of stress compared to their white peers.

A symposium on "Asian American Studies in Higher Education: Regional and National Policy Perspectives" brought Asian/Pacific American educators together in 1980 to discuss the past, the present, and future (some of the contributors' comments have already been cited). Among the recommendations for the decade of the 1980s were:

1. Develop community advisory boards (McGregor-Alegado, 1980) and student organizational linkages (Suzuki, 1980) to provide a continuing liaison between Asian/Pacific American Studies programs and the ethnic students and communities they serve and represent.

2. Legitimize Asian/Pacific American Studies in higher education. "Legitimization means simply acceptance on an equal basis with other academic endeavors" (Kashima, 1980, pp. 8-9). More specifically, Nakanishi (1980) recommended that the new Department of Education of the federal government play an active role in ensuring the viability of Asian/Pacific American Studies in particular, and ethnic studies in general.

3. Promote Asian/Pacific American Studies in the public schools, both elementary and secondary (Suzuki, 1980). Though Suzuki was specifically addressing the needs of the New England region, the recommendation could apply everywhere, as we have seen throughout this review.

4. Clarify the purposes and philosophy of Asian/Pacific American Studies: "Because of the diversity of programs and local problems, the basic definition of the field, of the many involved APA groups,

and even the perspective used to study this group has tended to remain unclear and indistinct" (Kashima, 1980, p. 5).

The data collected by Nakanishi and Leong (1978) reflected the basis for some of these recommendations. With regard to student involvement, they concluded that, "though Asian American Studies programs direct their activities toward students, our data does not reveal whether students are still encouraged to seek a broader role in determining the policies and activities of these programs . . . Our survey has uncovered some instances of continued student input, but it has probably become more difficult for students to play a direct role in shaping programs" (p. 17).

Nakanishi and Leong also wrote that the "relationship between the campus and the Asian American community outside of the campus has been equally important for Asian American Studies programs . . . but from our data it is difficult to analyze the nature or effectiveness of these activities" (p. 17). They also stated that the Asian American movement of the 60s and 70s now seems to be less influential in affecting Asian American Studies.

In a discussion of the goals of Asian American Studies, Nakanishi and Leong also remarked on their diversity. Some programs have maintained the objectives on which they were founded, "to provide students with an alternative educational perspective, to provide them with involvement in the decision-making process and planning of programs, and to provide a progressive framework for serving Asian American communities" (p. 18). Other programs, however, seem to have a different set of goals, such as academic legitimacy using the criteria for quality applied to established disciplinary fields. Even with the latter, Nakanishi and Leong noted that it is possible to maintain a progressive perspective.

Finally, Nakanishi and Leong, in the last statement of their report, wrote that the "need remains to develop a fundamental philosophy of what Asian American Studies should do both in terms of activities and research for its students and communities" (p.18). To interpret the basis for such a need, one can look to the social context beyond Asian/Pacific American education. The ambiguities seen in the legitimate charge assigned to Asian/Pacific American Studies are related to ambiguities in societal definitions of "minorityness." Raspberry (May 23, 1979, reprinted in *Bridge*), in a *Washington Post* article, wrote:

> What is a minority? Says Louis Nunez, staff director of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission:
>
> "If you combine all the constituencies of this commission now—racial minorities, women, the aged, the handicapped, religious groups—you're talking about maybe reducing

the oppressors to 20 percent of the population—20 percent oppressing 80 percent."

Which means that, on the basis of numbers alone, sound-bodied WASP males could claim minority status. Or they could claim "reverse discrimination" in favor of the recognized minorities.

On the one hand, this "rivalry for injustice" is a cynical, me-first game, undeserving of society's sympathy.

On the other hand, the matter is profoundly serious, representing, as it does, a multifaceted attack on programs designated to help society's true victims.

You and I know who they are.

Whatever the future of Asian/Pacific American Studies in higher education, certain assaults on their integrity and existence will continue. Endo (1974) identified a few. The Asian/Pacific American communities, for example, may criticize such programs for failing to attend to immediate, concrete, visible, community problems. Academic colleagues on campus demand the Asian/Pacific American Studies faculty increase their scientific research productivity and the rigor of their scholarship. And central administration often views ethnic studies programs as peripheral to the main concerns of a university.

And, again, the Model Minority Syndrome pervades higher education. The remarkable lack of alacrity in attending to Asian/Pacific Americans is contributed to by the belief—even among many Asian/Pacific Americans—that this ethnic group can stand on its own feet, has no problems that cannot be taken care of within the group, is an "advantaged disadvantaged" group that requires no undue special attention, and is not the butt of any significant amounts of racism (personal or institutional). The fate of Asian/Pacific American Studies in postsecondary education will be clearly tied directly to the civil rights movement in the larger social milieu, as it has in the past.

Conclusion

Where is Asian/Pacific American education going? The prospects for the future are variable from the limited vantage point we happen to occupy in the present. There may be some improvements. As more and more people become acquainted with the Asian/Pacific American ethnic experience, opportunities for adjustments in curriculum and teacher training programs may follow. However, such change will inevitably be slow, if the larger social context of education is not influenced. Gradual erosion of the Asian/Pacific American Model Minority Syndrome in favor of more realistic

perceptions is a priority. Also important is people's understanding that all Asian/Pacific Americans are not alike; the rubric includes a broad variety of people with different genetic, national, linguistic, social, psychological, and cultural heritages. Then, too, differentiation between Asians and Asian Americans must be effected. Dislike of Iranians carries over to Iranian Americans, as national dislike for Chinese led to Chinese Americans' being deprived of full citizenship rights in the past, as contempt for the Japanese in the war resulted in internment of Japanese Americans with American citizenship, and as American citizenship for residents of certain areas of South Pacific did not carry voting privileges in national elections.

Assumptions about Asian/Pacific Americans must therefore be changed. All Asian/Pacific Americans are not advantaged. Pilipino Americans suffer from a high dropout rate related to alienation from American schooling. Hawaiian Americans have an average annual income less than federal poverty standards. Although Japanese Americans may have incomes and educational levels at or above national averages, they do not rise to equal prominence.

In education, growing awareness of the language needs of Asian immigrants must be facilitated. The difficulty of providing subject matter experts to teach in one or more of the over 75 languages spoken by children living in various areas of the country must be addressed. The educational implications of cultural pluralism must be identified, and attempts made to overcome barriers to access to quality education.

In general, the overriding need is to convince Americans of the pluralistic nature of the world community. As linguists have clearly demonstrated with analyses of Black English, no language system is more or less complex than any other. The same holds true for the humanity that uses language. Cultural gaffes such as President Carter's hugging of the wife of Japan's late prime minister at public memorial services, in violation of cultural custom, could have been avoided with appropriate advice. A travel writer from the Pacific Northwest, invited to tour China, wrote incessantly of the lack of feminine civil rights in that country and wondered why the Chinese women were so content to be in their servile positions. Her ignorance of the relatively recent history of and difficulties faced by the women's rights movement in the Western world notwithstanding, her judgements of other cultures by standards in her own culture led to bigotry.

The fact in recent American history of a Watergate defense attorney's reference to an American-born United States Senator as a "little Jap" is not an isolated incident. When asked to interpret his remarks, the attorney said that Senator Daniel Inouye was just as free to refer to him as "a little American." This confusion between

race and nationality is epidemic. In a social climate where "nigger" is not heard as a seriously intended referent in the national media any more, "Jap" was heard in the 1970's. In 1975, in a large multicultural urban center on the West Coast, a new-car salesperson referred to the Dodge Colt, manufactured by Mitsubishi Corporation of Japan for Chrysler Corporation, as having been made "by the same company that made all them Jap Zeros [airplanes] in the war."

In 1979, a tour of classrooms in a predominantly white neighborhood revealed that bulletin boards and resource corner displays for a first-grade unit on Japan included Chinese lanterns, Chinese robes, and Chinese teapots and teacups, along with Polaroid snapshots of the Asian *American* children in the classes (many of whom were not Japanese) interspersed with posters of Japanese urban and rural scenes. Also in 1979, Mizokawa was approached by a white colleague to seek out the new dean of the College of Education, a Japanese American, to request a favor of "your friend." When he responded that he had only met the new dean at a coffee scheduled during the employment interview for the prospective dean, and was not therefore a friend, the colleague replied, "But you're both...." The pause was pregnant. In 1980, white children in a large suburban area of Seattle were seen placing their little fingers on the outer corners of their eyes, pushing up and saying, "Chinee," then pulling down and saying, "Japanese."

And Mizokawa and Morishima, the present authors, are constantly being confused for each other, though Mizokawa is big and overweight, wears glasses, and prefers Hawaiian shirts, while Morishima is lean, wears no glasses, and wears "non-ethnic" clothing. They get each other's mail, students refer to them in class by the other's name, and hostility toward one generalizes to the other (though, curiously, positive affect does not seem to share this transferability).

Yes, certainly, Asian/Pacific American education has come a long way, compared to the distant past. But the intent of this review was to demonstrate how much farther must be traveled before Asian/Pacific American Education can afford the luxury of not being a timely topic for discussion and analysis and if Asian/Pacific American education in any sense looks promising in the future, then civil rights must also, because quality of the latter is the determiner of the quality of the former. The issue is not Asian/Pacific American education at all. The issue is human rights.

Works Cited

Agcaoili, J. "The Pilipino Youth of the Central City and the San Francisco Educational System." In *Diwang Pilipino*, J. Navarro, ed. Davis, CA: University of California, Department of Applied Behavioral Science, 1974.

American Institutes for Research. *Evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/ English bilingual education programs.* Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1978.

Anderson, T., and Boyer, M. *Bilingual Education in the United States, Vols. I and II.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Anonymous. Personal communication (federal official in the Office of Bilingual Education, Department of Education, name withheld by request). August 1, 1980.

Arkoff, A. "Deference—East, West, Mid-Pacific: Observations Concerning Japanese, American, and Japanese-American Women." *Psychologia*, 1964, *7*, 159-164.

——, Meredith, G., and Iwahara, S. "Dominance-Deference Patterns in Motherland Japanese, Japanese-American, and Caucasian-American Students," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1962, *58*(1), 61-66.

Aronson, E., and Oserow, N. "Cooperation, Prosocial Behavior, and Academic Performance: Experiments in the Desegregated Classroom." In *Applied Social Psychology Annual, Vol. 1.* L. Brickman ed. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publications, 1980, 163-196.

Ayabe, H. "Deference and Ethnic Differences in Voice Levels." *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1971, *85*, 181-185.

Banks, J.A. *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies: Second Edition.* Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.

Benedict. R. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946.

Borje, R. "The Filipino American." *Jade Magazine*, 1974, *1*(2) 6-9.

Brown v. *the Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, 1954.

Bulosan, C. *America is in the Heart.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1973.

Burmark, L., and Kim, H.C. "The Challenge of Educating Vietnamese Children in American Schools. "*Integrateducation.* 1978, *16*(1), 2-8.

California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. *Asian Americans and Pacific Peoples: A Case of Mistaken Identity* (Report). Washington, D.C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights, February, 1975.

Callao, M.J. "Culture Shock—West, East, and West Again." *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1973, *51,* 413-416.

Center for Bilingual Education. *Directory of Asian and Pacific American Bilingual Programs in the United States.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory, June, 19.

Chang, S. *Bilingual Education: Facilitation, "Aye," but Maintenance?* Unpublished master's comprehensive paper. University of Washington, 1978.

Chao, R. *Chinese Immigrant Children: Preliminary Report.* New York: City University of New York, The City College, Department of Asian Studies, 1977.

Chin, F., Chan, J.P., Inada, L.F., and Wong, S.H. eds. *Aiieeeee!: An Anthology of Asian-American Writers.* Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1974.

Chin, L. "Chinese and Public School Teaching." In *Chinese-Americans: School and Community Problems.* Chicago, IL: Integrated Education Associates, 1972.

Chomsky, N. "Review of Verbal Behavior." *Language,* 1959, *35*(1), 26-58.

Connor, J.W. "Acculturation and Changing Need Patterns in Japanese-American and Caucasian-American College Students." *Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 93,* 293-294.

____ "Changing Trends in Japanese-American Academic Achievement." *Journal of Ethnic Studies,* 1975a, *2*(4), 958.

____. "Value Changes in Third-generation Japanese-Americans." *Journal of Personality Assessment,* 1975b, *39* 597-600.

Dang, H. *Bilingual Education: Maintenance or Facilitation?: The Case of the Seattle Asian American Communities.* Unpublished master's comprehensive paper. University of Washington, 1977.

Diamond, M.J., and Bond, M.H. "The Acceptance of 'Barnum' Personality Interpretations by Japanese, Japanese-Americans, and Caucasian-American Students." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 1974, *5,* 228-235.

Doi, L. T. "Amae—A Key Concept for Understanding Japanese Personality Structure." *Psychologia,* 1962, *5,* 1-7.

Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O., and Sears, R. *Frustration and Aggression.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1939.

Dubin, F., and Olshtain, E. *Facilitating Language Learning.* New Youk: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Elliott, J. Personal Communications to Authors. In *Psychology and Life,* P.B. Zimbardo and F. Ruch. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1977, 598-599.

Endo, R. *Asian Americans and Higher Education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Sociological Association, March, 1974.

——. "Whiter Ethnic Studies: A Re-examination of Some Issues." In *Asian-Americans: Psychological Perspectives,* S. Sue & N. Wagner eds. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1973.

Fenz, W.D. and Arkoff, A. "Comparative Need Patterns of Five Ancestry Groups in Hawaii." *Journal of Social Psychology,* 1962, *58*(1), 67-89.

Gerard, H.B. and Miller, N., eds. *School Desegregation.* New York: Plenum Press, 1975.

Getz, G.L. *A Content Analysis of the Programmatic Requirements for Teaching English as a Second Language.* Unpublished master's comprehensive paper. University of Washington, 1980.

Harris, L. *Characteristics of Self-regard, Locus of Control and Academic Achievement of Selected American Indian Students in Higher Education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1979.

Hosokawa, W.K. *Nisei: The Quiet Americans.* New York: William Morrow & Co., 1969.

Howells, G.M., and Sarabia, I.B. "Education and the Pilipino Child." *Integrateducation,* 1978, *16*(2), 17-20.

Hsu, F.L.K. *Americans and Chinese: Reflections on Two Cultures and Their People.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday Natural History Press, 1972.

Hutchinson, S., Arkoff, A., and Weaver, H.B. "Ethnic and Sex Factors in Classroom Responsiveness." *Journal of Social Psychology,* 1966, *69*(2), 321-325.

Inada, L.F. *Before the War.* New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1971.

Kagiwada, G., and Fujimoto, I. "Asian-American Studies: Implications for Education." *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1973,-*51*(6), 400-405.

Kashima, T. *Asian and Pacific American Studies in the Northwest: Strategies for the 1980's.* Symposium paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, Washington, D.C., April, 1980.

Kitano, H.H.L. *Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture,* Second edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1976.

Language Learning Council. "Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Teaching English as a Second Language." Seattle, WA: University of Washington, 1978.

Linsenmeir, J.A.W., and Wortman, P.M. "The Riverside School Study of Desegregation: A Re-examination." *Research Review of Equal Education,* 1978, *2*(2), 3-40.

Matsuda, L.Y., Director, Bilingual Programs, Seattle Public Schools. Personal communication, July 18, 1980.

McGregor-Alegado, D. *Asian American Perspectives on Educational Policy: The Hawaii Perspective.* Symposium paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, Washington, D.C., April, 1980.

Meredith, G.M. "*Amae* and Acculturation Among Japanese College Students in Hawaii." *Journal of Social Psychology,* 1966, *70,* 171-180.

Miller, G. "Summary and Conclusions." In *School Desegregation,* H.B. Gerard and N. Miller eds. New York: Plenum Press, 1975.

Nakanishi, D.T. *Asian American Studies and the Changing University.* Symposium paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, Washington, D.C., April, 1980.

——, and Leong, R. "Toward the Second Decade: A National Survey of Asian American Studies Programs in 1978. *Amerasia Journal,* 1978, *5*(1), 1-19.

Owan, T. "Asian-Americans: A Case of Benighted Neglect." Paper presented at the National Conference of Social Welfare, San Francisco, CA, May 13, 1975.

Parker, L.L. "Current perspectives." *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives: Synthesis.* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978, 12.

——. "Introduction." *Bilingual Education: Current perspectives: Social Science.* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Petersen, W. "Success Story: Japanese American Style." *The New York Times,* January 9, 1966.

Plessy v. *Ferguson,* 163 U.S. 537, 1896.

Raspberry, W. "Question: When is a Minority a Minority?" *Washington Post,* May 23, 1979. Reprinted in *Bridge,* 1979, *7*(2), 6-7.

Rosenthal, R., and Jacobson, L. *Pygmalion in the Classroom.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Santos, B.N. *Scent of Apples.* Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1979.

Schmid, C.F., Nobbe, C.E., and Mitchell, A.E. *Nonwhite Races: State of Washington.* Olympia, WA: Washington State Planning and Community Affairs Agency, 1968.

Skinner, B.F. *Verbal Behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

Stephan, W. "School Desegregation: An Evaluation of Predictions Made in Brown vs. the Board of Education." *Psychological Bulletin,* 1978, *85,* 217-238.

Steward, M., and Steward, D. "The Observation of Anglo-,Mexican-, and Chinese-American Mothers Teaching Their Young Sons." *Child Development, 1973, 44*(2), 329-337.

St. John, N. *School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Sue, D.W., and Frank, A.C. "A Typological Approach to Psychological Study of Chinese- and Japanese-American College Males." *Journal of Social Issues,* 1973, *29*(2), 129-148.

Sue, S., and Sue, D.W. "Chinese American Personality and Mental Health." *Amerasia Journal,* 1971, *1,* 36-49.

——. "Psychological Theory and Implications for Asian Americans." *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1977, *55,* 381-389.

Suzuki, B.H. *A Survey of Asian American Studies in New England: Current Status and Future Prospects.* Symposium paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, Washington, D.C., April, 1980.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees: Programs under the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA)." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, OMB-51-RO838, April 20, 1971.

Vazquez, J.A. "Bilingual Education's Greatest Potential: Enrichment for All." *NABE: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 1*,(1), May, 1976, 23-26.

Wang, L. L.-C. "*Lau* v. *Nichols:* The Right of Limited-English-speaking Students." *Amerasia Journal,* 1974, *2,* 16-45.

——. "*Lau* v. *Nichols:* History of a Struggle for Equal and Quality Education." In *Counterpoint: Perspectives on Asian America,* E. Gee, ed. Los Angeles, CA: Asian American Studies Center, University of California at Los Angeles, 1976.

Yee, A.H. "Asian-Americans in Educational Research." *Educational Researcher,* 1976a, *5*(2), 5 -8.

——. "Why Are There So Few Asian American Educational Researchers and Managers?" *Bulletin: Chinese History Society of America,* 1976b, *11*(1), 8-15.